

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected.

Claims 8 and 19 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Specifically, claims 1-7, 9-18, and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,377,983 (Cohen), in view of Logan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,683 (Logan). Claims 8 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Logan, and further in view of Fogg et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,163,778 (Fogg). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

For the reasons below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action dated July 29, 2003 (the “Office Action”) has not satisfied a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1-24.

The References Fail to Disclose All of the Claim Limitations

Cohen and Logan, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for operating a computer to present historical information about hyperlinks shown on web pages, including :

presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by users in the access group, (emphasis added)

as required by independent claim 1, and as generally required by independent claims 10 - 12, and 21 - 24.

Regarding this limitation, the Office Action states “Cohen does not explicitly teach presenting information representing characteristics of the data. However, Logan

teaches modifying the presentation of a document to represent characteristics of the document (col. 2, ln 1-52).” (Office Action, p. 3, para. 1). Applicants respectfully submit that Logan (and Cohen) do not teach or suggest the above limitation.

Logan does not teach or suggest “presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by users in the access group”, as recited in claim 1 and generally in claims 10 - 12, and 21 – 24. Rather, Logan teaches the alteration of a document as a way to control access to information (see Logan, col. 2, ln 33). For example, the cited portion of Logan on which the Office Action relies describes that when a given document is to be displayed on a kiosk monitor, the document is compared to a control file. Links in the document which a user can select are highlighted, and links in the document to which a user is restricted are suppressed. (see Logan, col. 2, lns 1 – 15). Thus, the highlighting and suppression of the links taught by Logan is a way to control access to information, and does not *present information about the characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by users in the access group*, as recited in claim 1, and generally in claims 10 - 12, and 21 – 24. Such characteristics of the underlying data as taught by Applicants can be, for example, the size of the data, time to download, number of hits, rating, date of most recent visit, just to name a few (see Specification, p. 12).

Furthermore, only for purposes of argument, even if Logan did disclose the above limitation, neither Cohen nor Logan disclose that the presentation is done *responsive to a computer receiving predetermined user input including direction of a cursor proximate a hyperlink*. Conceding that neither Cohen nor Logan disclose this limitation, the Office Action states that “it was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention for web pages and other software to output text and annotations in the form of popup bubbles, as in help environments or for more detailed information regarding underlying data (reference applicant’s admitted prior art, JP11039310).” (Office Action, p. 3). The Applicants respectfully traverse, and submit that the Office Action has mischaracterized JP11039310.

Accordingly, because neither Cohen nor Logan teach presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by users in the access group, Applicants respectfully submit that the references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose all of the Applicant's claim limitations. It follows that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been satisfied. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 - 12, and 21 – 24 are allowable over Cohen and Logan, taken alone or in combination. Claims 2 – 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 13 – 20 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 2 and 13

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 2 and 13 are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the presenting operation including at least one of the following: displaying text, displaying graphics, generating sound, providing tactile output. The Office Action states Logan teaches displaying text and graphics (Office Action, p. 4). However, while Logan may teach displaying text and graphics, Logan does not teach displaying them in the context of the presenting operation disclosed in claims 1 and 12, respectively. Furthermore, Applicants traverse the statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cohen and Logan and to include various types of output. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 13 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

Claims 3 and 14

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 3 and 14 are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the operations further comprising prior to consulting the database, selecting the database from multiple available databases. The Applicants traverse the statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cohen in order to have a related database associated with each access group be

selected along with the related access group. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 14 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

Claims 4 and 15

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 4 and 15 are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the operations further comprise, the computer obtaining user selection of types of characteristics of interest to the user; the presenting operation is limited to characteristics of the underlying data of the selected types. The Office Action states that “Cohen teaches a user selecting types of characteristics of interest to the user, wherein the presenting operation is then limited to those characteristics.” Applicants respectfully disagree. While Cohen may allow a user to select content headings in order to view web pages viewed by experts, Cohen does not disclose the operations further comprise, the computer obtaining user selection of types of characteristics of interest to the user; the presenting operation is limited to characteristics of the underlying data of the selected types. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 15 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

Claims 5 and 16

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 5 and 16 are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the predetermined user input additionally including depressing of one or more buttons on a computer mouse while the cursor is proximate the hyperlink. Although the Office Action cites to col. 2, ln 18-32 of Logan as teaching this limitation, nowhere does this cited portion of Logan teach the depression of one or more buttons on a computer mouse, much less disclose that the predetermined user input additionally includes the depressing of one or more buttons on a computer mouse while the cursor is proximate the hyperlink, as recited in claims 5 and 16. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 16 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

Claims 6-7, 17-18

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 6-7 and 17-18, are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the access group having a sole user, and the presenting operation presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by the sole user, as disclosed in claims 6 and 17; and the access group having multiple users, and the presenting operation presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by any of the multiple users. The Office Action states only that Cohen teaches an access group having one user and multiple users. While Cohen may teach an access group having one user and multiple users, Cohen does not disclose the limitations of claims 6-7 and 17-18 as recited above. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 6-7 and 17-18 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

Claims 8 and 19

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 8 and 19, are patentable over Cohen, Logan and Fogg because Cohen, Logan and Fogg fail to disclose the computer soliciting user specification of one or more of the following for the underlying data: user rating of the underlying data; one or more representative multimedia symbols of one or more of the following types: graphics images, sounds, videos, animations, tactile sensations; the computer recording the user specification in the database in association with the hyperlink. The Office Action states that Cohen and Logan do not explicitly teach this limitation, however, Fogg does teach acquiring rating information based on a user's attempted access of a hyperlink. (see Office Action, p. 6). Applicants respectfully submit that Fogg teaches the calculation of a rating of a document based on the viability of the links to the document. Fogg does not teach or suggest soliciting the rating from the user. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 19 are allowable over Cohen, Logan, and Fogg.

Claims 9 and 20

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 9 and 20, are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose that the characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections include one or more of the following: size of the underlying data; dates of one or more previous selections of the hyperlink; information representing a length of time required to download the underlying data; times of or more previous selections of the hyperlink; number of previous selections of the hyperlink; one or more representative multimedia symbols, including one or more of the following: graphics, sound, animation, video; user ratings of the underlying data; whether the underlying data constitutes a web site that is under construction; whether the hyperlink represents an expired link; whether the user has bookmarked the underlying the data; any errors occurring during previous selections of the hyperlink.

The Office Action states that Cohen teaches a number of characteristics being saved, including if the page was arrived at via a selection of a stored bookmark. (see Office Action, p. 5). Cohen teaches capturing methods a first user uses to access a document, including whether the document was accessed by a bookmark. Cohen takes this captured information and makes it available to a second user who then has the ability to view how a first user accessed a document. (see Cohen, col. 3, lines 25 – 45). Regarding this particular example, Cohen does not display whether or not the second user has bookmarked the data. In contrast, the Applicants' claims 9 and 20 recite that a number of characteristics of underlying data of a document are recorded responsive to each occasion on which a computer receives user selection of a hyperlink to download underlying data represented by the hyperlink, including whether *the user* has bookmarked the underlying data. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 20 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

There is No Motivation or Suggestion to Combine

Notwithstanding the fact that the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness

has not been satisfied because there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding the limitation of *presenting information representing characteristics of the underlying data obtained from previous selections of the hyperlink by users in the access group* in claim 1, and generally in claims 10 - 12, and 21 – 24, the Office Action states that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cohen and Logan in order to give the user a modified presentation based on the characteristics of document. This would have provided better navigation guidance to a user by enabling the invention to highlight document trails.” (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Cohen teaches capturing documents that experts view, categorizing the documents, and allowing a user to view the categorized list. (see Cohen, Abstract). Logan teaches a system to control access to content that is displayed on display units, such as kiosks. (see Logan, Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cohen and Logan in order to give the user a modified presentation based on the characteristics of document because Cohen would be restricted by the control methods of Logan. The purpose of highlighting document trails, as Logan teaches, is to indicate to a user of a kiosk display that the user has access to the document, at least from the kiosk. (see Logan, col. 2, lns 1-17). Restricting the categorized list provided by Cohen goes against the teachings of Cohen, which is to provide a list of all relevant captured content for a user to learn from. Further, since the highlight trails taught by Logan is for the purpose of indicating access to documents, and since Cohen does not teach or suggest, explicitly or implicitly a need for such access control, Cohen does not need to highlight any documents for access control. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the rejection of claims 1-24, and the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 – 24 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the numbers provided below.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, Washington, D.C. 20231, on November 26, 2003.	
	11/26/03
Attorney for Applicants	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Kennel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,562
Phone: (520) 799-2582
Facsimile: (520) 799-5551